arXiv:quant-ph/9701021v1 17 Jan 1997

CORRELATION BETWEEN QUANTUM MECHANICS AND CLASSICAL THEORY OF ROTATING ELECTRON MODELS AND POSSIBLE EXPERIMENT

V.N.Melekhin

17 January 1997

Abstract

It is shown that the point charge and magnetic moment of electron produce together such a field that total electromagnetic momentum has a component perpendicular to electron velocity. As a result classical electron models, having magnetic moment, move not along a straight line, if there is no external force, but along a spiral, the space period and radius of which are comparable with de-Broglie wave length. Some other surprising coincidences with quantum theory arises as a result of calculation. An experiment is proposed for direct observation of quantum or of new type electron delocalization.

1 Introduction

It is well known that electron spin and magnetic moment are pure quantum electron characteristics having no classical analogs. The main reason for such a conclusion is that the classical equation of electron motion can be derived from Shroedinger equation only in the limit of $\hbar \to 0$ when spin disappeares from the theory. On the other hand, if to introduce spin into classical theory, only new problems arises, such as superlight charge velocity, and there is no

correspondence with quantum theory, as it was demonstrated as early as 1926 by Frenkel [1].

However, there is some problem. If to calculate the electromagnetic momentum of a field generated by point electron charge together with its point magnetic moment, then one can see that in the general case this momentum has a component which is perpendicular to electron velocity. Such a strange result sends us to study situation more carefully using classical electron models. It has been found that this component of momentum changes the classical motion radically. Moreover, many coincidences with the quantum theory arises, to our astonishment. Of course, all these coincidences can be occasional, so some experiment is proposed to check a new approach.

2 Motion of rotating electron models

The equations for the motion of a classical electron model, having intrinsic angular momentum and moving in external electric field $\mathcal{E}_\circ$, are

$$\frac{d\mathbf{P}}{dt} = e\mathcal{E}_\circ, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{M}}{dt} = [\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}], \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is momentum, $\mathbf{M} = M_\circ \hat{\mathbf{m}}$ is angular momentum calculated relative to the center of symmetry of a charge e, $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ is the unit vector issued from the center of symmetry and directed along the axis of symmetry. The value of $\mathbf{P}$ is determined by the expression

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{U_\circ}{c^2}\left[(1+\kappa)\mathbf{v} - (3\kappa - 1)\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{v})\right], \tag{2}$$

where $U_\circ$ is the electromagnetic energy of a model, the center of which is at rest (for simplicity we count the charge to be of finite size and the nonelectromagnetic mass to be equal to zero), $\mathbf{v}$ is a velocity of the center of the charge ($v \ll c$), and $\kappa U_\circ$ is that part of the total energy $U_\circ$ which is created by the components of electric and magnetic fields being parallel to the axis of symmetry.

The most important feature of eq.(2) is that there is a component of $\mathbf{P}$ being parallel to the vector $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ and, hence, in the general case not parallel to the vector $\mathbf{v}$. As a result, the right side of the second equation (1) is not equal to zero, and this changes radically the character of the classical

motion. Let us emphasize that this perpendicular to $\mathbf{v}$ component $P_\perp$ arises not due to the finite size of discussed classical model but it is caused by the presence of "spin", because, as it was mentioned earlier, for a point electron model, having magnetic moment, the expression for the electromagnetic field momentum is similar to eq.(2). It is worth noting that the existence of such a component $P_\perp$ was revealed even in paper [1], however, the conclusion was made that this component vanishes because the axis of symmetry must rotate, under the influence of some "intrinsic" turning moment, in such a way that $(\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{v}) \to 0$. Let us show this assumption to be untrue.

Using eqs.(1) and (2) one can derive the following equations for an electron model motion

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = \frac{e\mathcal{E}_\circ}{\mathrm{m}_\circ(1+\kappa)} + \frac{(3\kappa-1)e\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathcal{E}_\circ)}{2\mathrm{m}_\circ(1-\kappa^2)} - \frac{\mathrm{m}_\circ(3\kappa-1)^2}{M_\circ(1+\kappa)}[\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{v}](\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{v})^2,$$

$$\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{m}}}{dt} = -\frac{\mathrm{m}_\circ(3\kappa-1)}{M_\circ}[\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{v}](\hat{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{v}), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathrm{m}_\circ = \frac{U_\circ}{c^2}$.

It is significant that in some particular cases we used not only the described method, when obtaining the equations (3), but some other one, that uses more involved mathematics but it is more direct method. In our paper [2] the formulae for a near field of a point charge, moving with acceleration and having an arbitrary velocity, were first obtained in an explicit form as a dependence of the field on coordinates. Using these expressions we determined the self-force and the turning moment produced by self-forces. Setting these values equal and opposite to external ones, we obtained the same equations (3). It proves that eqs.(3) hold and they really provide the conservation of momentum and angular momentum.

It follows from eqs.(3) that for free motion, when an external field $\mathcal{E}_\circ = 0$, the center of a model moves not along a straight line but along a spiral that we shall name "free spiral". The vector $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ is also rotating about the axis of free spiral. The radius R_s of this spiral, the angular frequency Ω_s of rotation of a model about the axis of a spiral and its space period λ_s are as follows:

$$R_s = \frac{M_\circ\sqrt{1-\hat{m}_z^2}}{\mathrm{m}_e v_z}, \quad \Omega_s = \frac{\mathrm{m}_e \hat{m}_z v_z^2}{M_\circ(G+\hat{m}_z^2)},$$

$$\lambda_s = v_z \frac{2\pi}{\Omega_s}, \quad G = \frac{2(1-\kappa)}{3\kappa - 1}. \tag{4}$$

Here $\hat{m}_z$ and v_z are the projections of a unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$, that determines the direction of spin, and of velocity $\mathbf{v}$ on the axis of free spiral which we assume to be directed along z-axis ($\hat{m}_z, v_z \equiv \text{const}$), the value of m_e is an effective mass of discussed model that is determined by the following expressions:

$$\mathrm{m}_e = \mathrm{m}_\circ \frac{(1+\kappa)G}{G + \hat{m}_z^2}, \quad P_z = \mathrm{m}_e v_z. \tag{5}$$

The x, y-oscillations of the center of a model relative to the axis of free spiral let us call free oscillations.

Notice that such a curved motion is the only chance not to violate the conservation laws in case when perpendicular component $P_\perp$ exists, which is caused by "spin" angular momentum. It is very curious that for $M_\circ \approx \hbar$ the radius R_s of free spiral is $R_s \approx \lambda_\circ$ with $\lambda_\circ$ being de-Broglie wave length. It means that such a classical electron model executes high-frequency transverse oscillations and for this reason it is delocalized by the value $\lambda_\circ$ independently on its own size, however small this size may be. At the same time the motion, averaged through a period of free oscillations, is usual classical motion of a particle of mass m_e, as it shows numerical calculation of eqs.(3) when the mean radius of curvature is much greater than the free spiral radius R_s.

Consequently, the free oscillations of a model allows us to overcome one of the most difficult problem of any theory using nonspherical electron model, because for such a model the "transverse" mass is not equal to the "longitudinal" one even at $v \to 0$. Let us remember that for a spherical model these masses are equal to each other but $M_\circ \approx \hbar$ only for superlight charge velocity [1], whereas for nonspherical model there is no such problem.

3 Other coincidences with quantum theory

The mentioned delocalization of a classical model by the value $\lambda_\circ$ is not unique correspondence with the quantum theory. For further discussion let us assume that

$$M_\circ \hat{m}_z = \pm\frac{\hbar}{2}, \quad \hat{m}_z = \pm\sqrt{\frac{G}{3}}, \tag{6}$$

i.e., the projection of the angular momentum $\mathbf{M}$ on the axis of the free spiral we count to be equal to the electron spin projection. Let us emphasize that this component of the angular momentum is the only one because transverse components of "spin" are compensated by the proper components of orbital momentum arising due to model rotation about the axis of free spiral. It follows from eqs.(4) and (6) that $\lambda_s = 2\lambda_\circ$. As a result, resonant phenomena take place, if our model interacts with periodic electric field, when its space period coincides with de-Broglie wave length, because after every half a period of free oscillations one can change $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ by $-\hat{\mathbf{m}}$, and this does not change two first members of the first equation (3) which determine the interaction of a model with an external electric field.

If an external field changes monotonically but an electron model executes some periodic motion, then again the resonance between the oscillations along the averaged trajectory and the transverse oscillations about this trajectory leads to a set of discrete energy levels. In particular, if an external field is not too strong and for this reason the free spiral is changed only slightly then the distance between these levels is just the same as it determines by the quasiclassical calculation because, as it follows from eqs.(4) and (6), phase shift of free oscillations along the trajectory is strictly the same as the quasiclassical ψ-function phase shift.

Moreover, if to calculate the electron model motion when electrical field $\mathcal{E}_z$, linearly changed in z-direction, is as strong as one likes, then energy spectrum has the same constant energy separation as it takes place in quantum theory for harmonic oscillator. Let us point out some additional correspondence of new theory with quantum mechanics.

If to introduce formally the values $\triangle p_{x,y} = \mathrm{m}_e v_{x,y}$ and to take into account eqs.(6) and the relations $\triangle x = \triangle y = R_s$, then $\triangle p_x \cdot \triangle x$ and $\triangle p_y \cdot \triangle y$ are comparable with $\hbar$. It means that delocalization of electron models, dictated by free oscillations, formally obeys usual uncertainty principle.

The commonly accepted standpoint is that spin is a pure quantum property which has no classical analog. If so, all described coincidences between new theory and quantum one must be treated as occasional. As it was mentioned, the main objection against using the concept of spin in classical theory

is the fact that the equations of classical motion follow from the quantum theory only at $\hbar \to 0$, when spin disappears from the theory. However, we can see that new approach allows to determine classical trajectories not in this limiting case but, due to averaging through free oscillations period, at finite value of $\hbar$, if the radius of curvature is much greater than the radius of free spiral R_s. So, the main objection against "classical" spin is eliminated, to our opinion.

One could see that the parameters of free spiral obey the "uncertainty principle", hence, the radius of spiral R_s is so small that usually this spiral may not be observable. For this reason the existence of the free spiral contradicts nor to the classical theory nor to the experimental results. The quantum theory does not include the concept of trajectories, so it is possible that here there is no contradiction too. If to take into account that the possible existence of the free spiral follows just from the conservation laws, may be, this result is something more than a fixed idea?

4 Discussion and "experimentum crucis"

A set of new problems arises if to admit the existence of the "classical" spin but, on the other hand, we could solve some difficult old problems. In quantum theory delocalization of the electron by the value $\lambda_\circ$, where $\lambda_\circ \to \infty$ at $v \to 0$, ceases to be incomprehensible and obtains simple physical meaning. In classical theory the finite electron size, which exceeds "classical" electron radius (10^{-13}cm), eliminates the well-known problem of so called "run-away" solutions of Lorentz-Dirac equation (see [3]).

Some other problems also could be solved in very unusual manner. For example, high-energy electron-electron scattering, at first sight, excludes any other model than point electron. However, this is true only for the spherical model. Let us calculate the model with pure electromagnetic mass, which consists of thin charged ring, rotating with the velocity of light. In this case greater radius b is about 10^{-11}cm, whereas little radius a is only 10^{-120}cm. Hence, two such models, placed in two parallel planes, could slip at such little distance between the centers of these rings that it would be indistinguishable from point electrons.

At first sight, not only point model but even extended model must include nonelectromagnetic mass, because some attractive nonelectromagnetic force

must compensate coulomb repulsion. However, let us examine this problem more carefully. When the distance between two separated charges increases the mutual electric energy, decreasing at such process, could convert into magnetic energy of each moving charge, and the work of coulomb force measures this conversion. In case of two charged parts of the same electron model the situation is quite different. For example, in case of uniformly charged sphere such a conversion is prohibited because the magnetic field is equal to zero at any point from symmetry considerations when radial expansion takes place. It happens so because the magnetic fields, produced by different parts of a charge, are mutually cancelled.

Such interference of magnetic fields changes completely the concept of a force that acts "inside" the electron. Mentioned annihilation of magnetic fields at each space point could observe only for the spherical model, but for any other model this interference also does not permit the exact conversion of electric energy into magnetic one. Consequently, "inside" the electron one can not introduce the force of mutual coulomb repulsion as a measure of such energy exchange. It is worth remembering Lorentz' idea that we probably make a mistake when we try to apply our usual concept of a force to different parts of the same electron (see paragraph 182 in monograph [4]). If so, why we can not discuss the electron model with pure electromagnetic mass that does not expand and moves in such a way that all conservation laws hold?

Of course, new approach gives us a set of new problems but their discussion in this paper seems to be premature. We might discuss them in more detail if any experimental results were obtained that could support new concept. Probably, such an experiment is as follows. It consists of observation of very slow electrons passage (with the energy of 10^{-2}eV) through a nuclear filter having holes of the diameter $D \sim 10^{-6}$cm. For electrons, having so low energy that $\lambda_\circ > D$, the passage of classical point models would not change, the part of real passed electrons must decrease gradually because of diffraction, and new electron models, moving along the free spiral, must demonstrate a drastic decrease in the number of passed electrons when $R_s > \frac{D}{2}$.

5 Conclusion

A reader of this paper must not conclude that its author tried to develop pure classical electron theory that could explain quantum electron behavior. It is well known that there exist too many problems which prevent us from such an attempt. Nevertheless, the commonly accepted point of view that spin is pure quantum property, having no classical analogy, seems to be too vigorous, and in this paper we tried to use some new ideas to introduce spin into classical theory. In any case, the above-mentioned challenge concerning with the electromagnetic momenrum component, which is perpendicular to electron velocity, must be investigated not only for classical model but for real electron too.

References

[1] J.Frenkel, *Z.f.Pfysik*, **37**, 243 (1926).

[2] V.N.Melekhin, *Sov.Phys.JETP*, **70**(3), 423 (1990) (translated from *Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.*, **97**, 757, 1990)

[3] P.Pearle "Classical electron models", in book "Electromagnetism, Paths to Research" (Plenum Press, New York, 1982) p.211.

[4] H.A.Lorentz "The Theory of Electrons and its Applications to the Phenomena of Light and Radiant Heat", Leipzig, B.G.Teubner, 1916.